

Claims 2 and 7 recite a first multiplexer and a second multiplexer circuit, distinct from the first multiplexer. The Examiner concedes that McConnell does not disclose a second, separate multiplexer circuit distinct from the first multiplexer. The Examiner cites Bunton as disclosing two or more distinct multiplexer circuits and contends that it would have been obvious to use the second multiplexer circuit in McConnell to decrease the “design and manufacturing costs”.


First, Examiner’s reason for modifying McConnell is not convincing since adding a component to a circuit does not decrease design and manufacturing costs, but increases such costs. Secondly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not include a first multiplexer and a second multiplexer circuit, distinct from the first multiplexer, in McConnell since, as noted above, it is the InfiniBand™ architecture that multiplexes virtual lanes on a single port. Still further, one would not employ the multiplexers of Bunton used to reorder in individual lanes in a physical link in the virtual lane mechanism (Fig. 6) of McConnell.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-0687, under Order No. 95-520, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Manelli Denison & Selter, PLLC


Edward J. Stemberger
Registration No. 36,017
(202) 261-1014

Customer No. 20736

Date: June 16, 2008

Response filed June 16, 2008
Appln. No. 10/083,149
Page 4